DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 112 717 HE 006 642

AUTHOR Pfnister, Allan O.
TITLE Trends in Higher Education in the United States. No. 2. Students in the 70's. A Review of Recent Literature. A Report to the Commission on the Future, the Lutheran Educational Conference of North America.
INSTITUTION Lutheran Educational Conference of North America, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 75
NOTE 52p.; For related documents, see HE 006 640-641, 643-645
AVAILABLE FROM Allan O. Pfnister, Professor of Higher Education, University of Denver, 2199 S. University Blvd., Denver, Colorado 80210 ($2.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; *Educational Trends; *Higher Education; *Literature Reviews; Longitudinal Studies; Managerial Occupations; Political Attitudes; Social Values; Student Attitudes; *Student Characteristics; Student College Relationship; Student Motivation; Student Opinion

ABSTRACT

Contemporary American college students are compared with students of the 1960s, whose actions have become points of reference for discussions of the pre-1960s and post-1960s. Longitudinal studies are reviewed that indicate the gap within the generation of young people in 1969 was greater than the gap between the generations. The campus was becoming highly politicized, with a large proportion of students sharing the views of the minority group of revolutionaries. A 1971 study noted a change in mood, away from personal despair and depression. The 1973 students seemed more prepared to accept or at least work within the established political lines and had more confidence in society. Striking differences are noted between entering in 1966 and those in 1973, with increases in interest in business fields and decreases in engineering. Increasing numbers of women and minority students are cited. Problems in the job market are seen, and opportunities in the 1970s are outside the traditional professions, concentrated instead in government administrative and management fields, business management, sales, advertising, and other service industries. Developments in student attrition rates are also discussed. (JMP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

TRENDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

NO. 2 STUDENTS IN THE 70's
(A Review of Recent Literature)

A Report to
The Commission on the Future

THE LUTHERAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE OF NORTH AMERICA

Allan O. Pfnister
University of Denver

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 006 642

March, 1975

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Allan O. Pfnister
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Lutheran Educational Conference of North America
955 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W. Suite 4500 North Building Washington, D.C. 20024

Preface

This is one of six monographs written during the period covering the latter half of 1974 and the first months of 1975 and that review developments in American higher education through the mid-1970s. The sources have been articles and books published in large part between 1964 and 1975. Writing during this period has been voluminous, augmented in the last five years by the many reports, staff studies and other project prompted by, or related to, the work of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The output has been so great that it is difficult for the college administrator, much less a faculty member involved in his own discipline, to view the literature in any broad perspective.

When the Lutheran Education Conference of North America established its Commission on the Future in 1972, it developed a series of proposals for projects that would result in documents useful for planning among the colleges related to the Lutheran Church. One of the resources requested by the Commission on the Future was an overview of the current status of higher education in the United States as that was reflected in the contemporary literature. In addition, the Commission requested that this overview be particularly directed to the implications for planning for the Lutheran colleges.

In early 1974 I was asked to undertake this particular phase of the work of the Commission. After the Commission approved a preliminary outline, and after I had completed certain other commitments, including meetings in Germany and Switzerland in June, 1974, I turned to the development of these monographs. I had considered assembling the materials in a single and fairly brief report. As the writing progressed, however, it became obvious that I would not be able to complete the work, at least to my satisfaction, in a single document. After making several revisions in the format, I decided on six monographs, five of which would deal with general topics, and the sixth of which would focus upon the colleges related to the

Lutheran Educational Conference of North America. The Commission on the Future reviewed drafts of four of the monographs in October, 1974 and approved the continuation of the work.

The six monographs are being issued under the general title of Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature. The titles of the six monographs are:

No. 1 Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature--Enrollments

No. 2 Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature--Students in the 70s

No. 3 Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature--Governance (Organization and Administration)

No. 4 Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature--Instructional Programs

No. 5 Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature--Financing the Program

No. 6 Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature--Implications for the Predominantly Undergraduate Church-Related Institution

The monographs, while each of them is fairly lengthy, do not pretend to present an exhaustive analysis of all of the literature that has been produced. The selection of books and articles from which the material is drawn was arbitrary. These are the items considered by the author to be of significance and that were readily accessible to him and that would appear to be readily accessible to those who would be using the monographs. Each monograph provides a substantial cross-section of the writing and opinion on each of the topics. The sixth monograph draws upon the preceding five monographs and attempts to outline specific implications for planning for predominantly undergraduate church-related institutions. It will be noted that, and this is particularly the case for the most recent information, the monographs draw heavily upon the Chronicle of Higher Education. The Chronicle provides the

most up-to-date references on the items covered; some of the references are taken from issues in December 1974 and January 1975.

--Allan O. Pfnister
Professor of Higher Education
University of Denver
January 1975

The Mid-Seventies, A Time of Reflection?

It seems almost inevitable that any discussion of the contempory (mid-1970s) American college students will begin with and/or end with a reference to the 1960s. Without giving a second thought, we refer to today's student in terms of how much he or she is similar or dissimilar to the student of the 1960s. At the time (in the 1960s) the period seemed in so many ways to be unique: the student actions of the decade have become points of reference for discussions of the pre-1960s and post 1960s.

Calvin Lee observes that the 1960s began with a conviction "in the immediate betterment of man" and concluded, for the college student at any rate, with a sense of distress at "the complexity of life around them."[1] He continues in summary:

> The Sixties brought to the American colleges commitment, involvement, relevance and pot. It brought participatory democracy, student evaluation of professors, student involvement in the decision-making process, the end of academic credit for R.O.T.C. The Sixties brought mass take-overs of classroom buildings, administrative offices, and computer centers, fires in libraries, clashes with police, confrontation with the National Guard. It produced a backlash of state legislators, members of Congress, the courts, the general public, parents, alumni, and academic administrators. The richness of the Sixties brought the idealism, style, graciousness, and dedication of JFK. It also brought cynicism and disgust with war, the draft, the System, and a greater awareness of the anomie of human existence in modern society. The Sixties brought a larger and more talented student body than ever before. It also brought students who questioned the values on which the academic community was built, its structure and basic rationale for continuing.[2]

The halls of ivy had never been wholly isolated from society, romantic notions to the contrary notwithstanding, but to observers and participants the 1960s were somehow different from anything in the past.

The first months of the decade witnessed the first sit-in (February 1, 1960), and students were soon involved in the civil rights movement. In 1964 three civil rights workers were murdered in Mississippi. The Berkeley student revolt began in September, 1964. The protests moved out from concerns over civil rights to include

reactions in general to the war in Viet Nam and reactions in specific to situations on campus. Protestors marched on the Pentagon, an Oakland draft-induction center was surrounded by 10,000 protestors, and Oberlin College students kept a Navy recruiter trapped in his car for hours. Five buildings at Columbia University were occupied in the late Spring, 1968. The Institute for Defense Analysis was blockaded at Princeton in the fall, and in April, 1969, the Administration Building at Harvard was occupied. In the Fall of 1968 San Francisco State College had been closed down because of tension over black studies. Then Kent State broke into the headlines in May, 1970.

In the forward of the Carnegie Commission report dealing with the events at Kent, Clark Kerr, Chairman of the Commission, observed:

> Campus turmoil is almost certainly not solely a thing of the past. But the climax of dissent, disruption, and tragedy in all American history to date occurred in May 1970. That month saw the involvement of students and institutions in protests in greater number than ever before in history. The variety of protest activities -- both violent and non-violent -- seem to exhaust the entire known repetoire of forms of dissent.[3]

Another Carnegie report, Dissent and Disruption, indicated that nearly one-quarter of the institutions in the United States had experienced incidents of violence or disruptive protests during 1968-69.[4] That particular volume went on to say that the United States, "in the past decade, has been in greater internal turmoil than at any time since the period of the Civil War a century ago. The campuses have, in recent years, been in the greatest turmoil in all their history of over three centuries."[5] The Commission volume calls attention to the number of official reports on dissent and disruption issued during 1969 and 1970, the most widely read being the Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest, 1970, the so-called Scranton Report.[6]

In contrast to the literature of the 1960s, the contemporary writings report that students have switched from activism and are now apparently working inside the system.[7] The students of the mid-1970s combine "an intense sense of their private

worlds with a most practical view of the prospects before them.[8] A researcher who has conducted surveys of American youth since 1967 finds in 1973 that campus rebellion has become moribund, that criticism of the universities has decreased and that college students appear to have developed greater acceptance of the requirements of law and order.[9]

Do we indeed have a "new breed" of student in the mid-1970s? What is in the offing for the second half of the 1970s? What factors should we take into account in our planning? Let us review some of the analyses of the 1960s and those purporting to describe the student of the 1960s.

What Happened in the 1960s?

If we are going to refer to the 1970s by way of contrast to the 1960s, we need to ask what actually happened in the 1960s? We find no simple answer. The events of the 60's and early 70's generated not only a series of official reports but a large volume of books and articles analyzing the student at the time and offering suggestions regarding the causes and cures of disruption. One doctoral study completed in August, 1972, reviewed over 90 volumes directed specifically to analyzing the causes of campus disturbance and referred in addition to a score or more volumes that were addressed to the broader social and political issues of the period.[10] The last volumes reviewed in that study had been published in late 1971 or early 1972, and there have been many more volumes published since.

Harold A. Korn, in the preface to the volume, Student Activism and Protest, observes that the 1960's were a time of national turmoil and crisis, a period of outbursts of mass discontent that challenged the legitimacy of the authority of social institutions and established leadership, and many social scientists "became psychological newsmen, analyzing the day's events that same evening and preparing their reports for publication the next day." Scores of "scholarly" pieces were hastily turned out to interpret what was happening and why, but "none of us, even

now, have had sufficient time away from the battle lines to take stock of the numerous change in events. We all suffer from the lack of perspective that the passage of time provides -- the guide that permits the analyst to gaze backward and to see clearly and in perspective the key events and turning points that mark the given era."[11]

Robert Karsten's study, as it sought to identify the interpretations of causes and meanings of the protest, found no less than eight different categories of explanation. He referred to the categories as: (1) holistic -- the university reflected the problems of society in general; (2) failures in higher education -- the enterprise had itself fallen short of expectations; (3) psychological -- these were personal problems and personal responses to a period of conflict and tension; (4) technological society -- persons were revolting a dehumanizing technology; (5) call to agenda -- persons were calling society to face the explicit and implicit ideals of society; (6) counterculture -- American society was experiencing the birth of a counter-culture; (7) political -- the protests were essentially expressions of political activity; (8) conspiracy -- certain leaders were behind the rash of outbursts and were pursuing their own private goals. But he concluded that the distinctions are never finely drawn:

> The classification does not show a systematic tendency among the interpretations of campus disturbance to favor one interpretive group over the others. To be sure, the theories on psychological causes and on failures within higher education are the most frequently represented in the literature, and contain the greatest variation. However, authoritative sources have been included among the witnesses to each of the other theories, and, in the light of this, it is difficult to argue that the weight of scholarly opinion can be taken to suggest that one set of causes or meanings was more likely to have been concretely operative than another.
>
> It seems more likely, in the light of the relatively uniform distribution of the interpretations among the eight interpretive groups, and in the presence of the multiple relationships among them, that the literature on campus disturbance must be taken to suggest that the causes and meanings of the protest movement were many, and interrelated. Indeed, we are perhaps permitted to think of the classification as a kind of table for a multivariant analysis, or a matrix of inter-related propositions which

> must, in common with all matrices, be looked at whole in order to make sense. That is to say, the theories do not allow us to think of the causes and meanings of campus disturbance in terms of single variables, but only in terms of their relationships.
>
> Some of the most important authorities on campus disturbance say the phenomenon was complex in its causality. For example, John Searle said that the student revolts were caused by many things and that they were, if anything, 'over-determined.' The Presidential Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence reported: 'The problem of campus unrest is more than a campus problem. Its roots lie deep in the larger society. There is no single cause, no single solution.'[12]

One of the more frequently advanced set of explanations for the student unrest points up, as does Karsten, the complexity of the matter. Professor S. L. Halleck of the University of Wisconsin presented to the meeting of the American Association for Higher Education in 1968 what he termed "Twelve Hypotheses of Student Unrest."[13] Emphasizing that hypotheses were at best only partial explanations, he divided his 12 into "favorable,""unfavorable," and "neutral." The "unfavorable" suggested that there was something wrong with the students, the "favorable" suggested the problems lay with man-made circumstances, and the "neutral" grew out of changes in a highly complex society. Many of the same categories developed by Karsten are paralleled in Halleck's analysis, though Karsten's covers a wider range of possibilities.

Another analysis that emphasizes that there is great complexity of interaction among the factors that appear to have involved in the student unrest, is that of Donald R. Brown contained in Student Activism and Protest.[14] He proposes that there are some 13 factors that may be associated with the "greater visibility and activity" of the students. Referring to the character of the 1960s, he states:

> 1. The college student population has grown astronomically since 1946. The more students, the greater the visibility and, more important, the greater the pressures which arise on campus from overcrowding and depersonalization.
>
> 2. College attendance is increasingly seen as a necessity in an ever-increasing technological and affluent society such as present-day America.... However, the pragmatic relevance of college has decreased as affluence allows students to seek the social sciences and humanities versus the more directly applied areas of knowledge.

3. Students come from a wider range of the population on all demographic dimensions than they previously did and, consequently, present new challenges to the colleges as socialization agencies.

4. The post-Sputnik emphasis on the meritocracy and the sellers' market consequent to the increased numbers has put students under great competitive stress for admission even to the less prestigious institutions.

5. In terms purely of visibility, the news-hungry media tend to fan the sparks of unrest by massive and immediate publicity which has no trouble in finding among our campus population its own performers.

6. The sophistication of students about their individual rights in respect to the university and to the society and about the insensitivity of faculties and administrators within the institutions of higher education to the crying need for immediate and meaningful reform has increased considerably.

7. The better academic preparation in the secondary schools following the massive curricular reform movements which started in the middle 1950s has resulted, in part, in students who have tasted good teaching and want more of it.

8. Students are painfully aware of the contradictions of a society in which affluence and freedom exist side by side, for all to see, with poverty and the enslavement of ignorance, discrimination, and hopelessness. The hope is for peace but the harsh reality is war. The hope is for meaning but the immature can see only the hypocritical glitter of Madison Avenue materialism.

9. Emphasis on the existential view of self-determination, responsibility, and deep meaningful and personal communication on the essence of one's self-identity and existence is gradually replacing the older emphasis on pragmatism in action and privacy in personal matters as the mass ethic of the younger intelligentsia. This new emphasis is part of the conflict of style and faith so evident in the appearance and rhetoric of today's student leaders.

10. The inherent loneliness of youth as it seeks self-definition and clarity has been increased by the rise of anonymity accompanying the moral blandness of a society in which guilt is hard to define and therefore impossible to expiate.

11. The student generation has a phobia of the increasingly technological mechanization of the societal means of dealing with large numbers, as personified in the IBM card, which threatens the less stouthearted with an overwhelming crisis of depersonalization. This phobia is coupled with a rather naive view that technology has advanced to the point where personal effort and work are no longer required except on the part of a few specially recruited and trained technicians.

12. The changing image of college life from the social to the intellectual has caused increasing numbers of entering students to have unrealistically high expectations of the curriculum, the faculty, their peers, and of the intellectual life which are unfortunately rarely fulfilled.

13. Physical maturation has been taking place at a lower and lower chronological age for the last several decades. While this speeding up of physical maturity has been going on, we have been systematically delaying psychological, social, and economic maturity in our student population by increasing the length of years devoted to study in preparation for assuming one's life roles. This kind of delay results in greater and greater delay of the independence and gratification that come with striking out on one's own -- which traditionally took place at ages seventeen to twenty in previous generations.[15]

Some of Brown's observations appear dated as one reviews comments about the current (mid-1970s) generation of students, a generation that is part of what may soon be a decreasing enrollment in higher educational institutions and is seen as increasingly materialistic and calculating.

It is not our intent in this monograph to examine in any detail the earlier published studies of the campus unrest of the 1960s. As Harold Korn has suggested, we are probably too close to the events to be able to develop the necessary perspective. Yet, in planning for the 1970s we cannot ignore the preceding decade and the happenings of the immediate past. At least we have learned (or should have learned) that we cannot take the student population for granted, and we should certainly be less ready to say in 1974 what Clark Kerr said in 1959: "I can just see.....that they are not going to press many grievances.....they are going to do their jobs, they are going to be easy to handle. There aren't going to be riots. There aren't going to be revolutions. There aren't going to be many strikes."[16] And we should be more aware that forces operating on the campus at any one time are exceedingly complex.

And some generalizations, even at this point in time so close to the events, seem to be in order. First of all, most of the early reports hastened to point out that the students most actively involved were generally among the elite of the student body. Edward E. Sampson refers to "a select group of protest-prone,

intelligent persons who share equalitarian familial backgrounds."[17] Kenneth Keniston, after reviewing a number of studies of those involved in protest, generalized that "student protestors appear to be generally outstanding students: the higher the student's grade point average and the more outstanding his academic achievement, the more likely he is to become involved in any particular political demonstration. Similarly, student activists come from families with liberal political values."[18]

While scores of comments of the sort noted above could be cited, some subsequent analyses have questioned these generalizations. John Horn and Paul Knott did not find clear evidence one way or the other; it is not clear whether the activist was more intelligent than the non-activist, but "the results clearly indicate that activists were capable students in the fields in which they chose to major."[19]

More recently, Larry Kerpelman observes that many of the researchers in the sixties had concluded that the activists were "close to being psychological noblemen." He argues that from his own review of the literature he found severe flaws in "the supposedly solid evidential base that served as the basis for that view." After pointing out some of the problems in the student activist research, he goes on to report on his own study, a "carefully selected questionnaire battery administered to 229 students at three leading institutions of higher education in the United States in the late 60's," and he notes that the most striking finding in this intelligence and personality test "was that there were no measures on which any of the six activism-ideology subgroups differed from the others."[20] He found some measures by which various groups of activists were clearly different from various groups of non-activists: there were some personality differences in that activists seem to value leadership more, to be more sociable and more ascendant and assertive and less needful of social support. But he found no differences with regard to "intelligence, emotional stability, or responsibility and restraint." He concludes his article:

> To be sure, left activists have sought positive changes in American society -- and end to war as a way of resolving conflicts and an end to secret research on American campuses, to sight a couple of examples. But in an effusion of positive halo effect, social science and education researchers have rushed to place positive value as well on the psychological qualities of the student activist. The result has been a picture of those students that has been clouded by questionable methods and questionable conclusions. That picture is only now beginning to clear.[21]

Peterson and Bilousky call attention to other studies that call into question the generalization that the activists were the "brighter" students.[22] They do observe, however, that campus activism seems clearly to have been associated with some general and overall quality of the student body. While not all "bright" youths were involved, those campuses where the overall average in intellectual ability was high were more likely to have been involved in dissent.[23] Peterson's earlier report noted that the incidence of activism was higher in the more select colleges and universities. His subsequent report, dealing with 1967-1968, seem to suggest the same conclusion, although the only correlations that had any significance seem to be related to war issues, i.e. those campuses in which war issues provided the basis for disruption or protest seem to be higher "quality" institutions.[24]

A second point on which most of the studies seem to agree is that the students involved represented a minority of the student body. Horn and Knott judged that from most estimates of the individuals taking part in demonstrations, no more than 15 percent of the student body was involved.[25] James Trent refers to some of his own studies and concludes that "a very few select students and a very few select colleges and universities" were involved, at least up to 1966. He goes on to summarize other studies, noting that at Berkeley no more than 3 percent of the student body was committed enough to the Free Speech Movement to risk arrest and that an American College Survey report on sophomores in 1965 found less than 3 percent of the students who could be classified as activists.[26] Peterson's study found only 9 percent of the students involved in protest movements, and in the second study he noted that the proportions of activists within the student bodies had not changed.[27]

A third generalization is suggested by Peterson and Bilousky. While May 1970 saw the involvement of large number of students all over the country in response to the Kent State events, the writers concluded that "American mass student political movements, as phenomena involving continuing participation and collective actions by many more than the heretofore highly committed activists, are unable to sustain themselves in the absence of new or continuing issues or provocations."[28] They found that the May protest had begun to fade by mid-month, and the relative calm of the campuses the following fall astonished almost all observers. Peterson and Bilousky suggest some of the reasons for the lack of sustained action: students became involved in their own personal priorities; some were cynical and pessimistic over the possibility of bringing about any significant changes; the campus climate as a matter of fact was changing positively; national and international events contributed to a growing calmness.

A fourth generalization that may be drawn from most of the reports is that whatever initially may have triggered off a particular series of events on a campus -- whether the events were directly traceable to some specific problems on campus -- in general the protests did point up a range of serious problems on campuses. Perhaps this point is made as clearly as in any study in the Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest, in which an entire chapter is given to the subject of university reform. The chapter points out that the events signaled "many serious weaknesses in American colleges and universities" and that recent history "has made it only too clear that the failure of the university to pursue effectively its stated goals, let alone to live up to them, has also contributed to student unrest."[29] This sentiment formed a recurring theme, and almost any of the reports dealing with campus unrest at one point or another referred to the need for on-campus changes.

Were There Any Lasting Outcomes of the Years of Dissent?

How are we to assess the consequences of the events of the 1960s? What impact, if any, have the protests had on the American campus? Are the campuses any different in the 1970s because of the activities of the 1960s? Fred Hechinger, former education editor of the New York Times, takes a fairly restrained view of the consequences of the actions of the sixties. In particular, as he refers to Reich's The Greening of America, in which the writer speaks of "a Revolution: the rebirth of people in the sterile land," Hechinger's comment is scathing:

> In retrospect, it is evident that professor Reich's euphoric account was actually written not at the beginning but at the tail end of a mini-revolution that would not survive the dawn of the new decade. But at the time, the utopian delusion was so widespread that Reich may be forgiven for his misreading of a phenomenon that seemd to him and to so many others a historic tide rather than a political flash flood that has since receded. [30]

He sees the election of 1972 as the barometer of change, where fewer than half of the newly enfranchised youths voted, in comparison to 71 percent of the over forty-fives. The 1960s "Youth Cult" had begun, according to Hechinger, to fade out even before then. The campuses were quiet by 1972. Some reforms were effected:

> They brought about some reforms, though hardly a revolution, and even the reforms frequently suffered from lack of sustained interest and follow-through. The rebels opened the doors to admit some young people to the university's governing boards, with mildly beneficial though hardly earth-shaking effects. In the main, however, the young are back at work and play, competing for grades and for jobs. [31]

Hechinger goes on to argue that the "Youth Cult," as he terms it, never enjoyed mass support and "made no sustained effort either to recognize or to break out of its ideological isolation." He doubts there was a generation gap, and observes that the generations "despite superficial and over-reported differences, were actually very much alike." He finds many of the characterisitcs of the movement reflected in the older generation.

Hechinger disagrees with those who "hail the end of the youth rebellion as a great blessing and relief" because he notes that "the youth movement contained vital elements of rebellion against real flaws in America, or perhaps simply post-industrial, society" and argues that if some of the "progressive, socially conscious gains of the rebellion" are not to be lost, adult leadership must be more responsive and responsible. For, "the fiction must be laid to rest that there is a separate youth force that can rise phoenixlike from the ashes of adult demoralization and corruption. Societal renewal is more complex."[32]

On the other hand, a report in U. S. News and World Report suggests that a good many changes effected during the sixties are having an impact upon the seventies. Some of the reforms, including "pass-fail" as a substitute for regular grading, seem to be falling out of favor, some of the more unstructured "experimental courses" are not as popular as they were, but in other respects there are some significant and continuing differences. It is argued that college students are being treated more as adults, that faculty members are more committed to teaching, that there is more experimentation, but experimentation within the context of maintaining academic standards. The article points out changes in calendar, adoption of interim programs, providing more flexible ways of meeting requirements, reduction of requirements, and more direct involvement of students in governance. On the latter it is noted that students have "a much larger voice than ever before in running America's universities and colleges, and in establishing the pattern of their own education."[33]

Stephen Weissman, a political science research associate at Stanford, finds that while the students have stopped sieging buildings and breaking windows, they have in no sense retreated from social concerns and commitments. During his year as a research associate at Stanford he interviewed many students, faculty members and administrators and concluded that at least at Stanford there is a "high level of critical social and political consciousness, although its manifestations are

less dramatic, disruptive of academic routines, and all-pervasive than they were in the days of mass mobilization." The active minority is not, he contends, disillusioned, but are better organized and less "millenarian" and more strategy-oriented. He sees no return to the 1950s. He comments on the increase of student-conceived courses and more openness within the university to variations in thought.[34]

Harold Hodgkinson reports that at least as the presidents of 1230 colleges and universities perceive it, there have been significant changes in faculty, administration and students between 1958 and 1968. While he does not attempt to relate any direct way the changes to student dissent in the 1960s, he does call attention to significant changes in governance patterns that show more student involvement in decision-making.[35]

What is Being Said About the Students of the Seventies?

General Reports

How are the students of the 1970s being characterized in the current literature? Many writers are pointing to the great variation among students and suggesting that it is difficult, if not impossible, to capture this variety in any single characterization. While the article was written in the early 1960s, the observations of Nevitt Sanford at that time are probably even more appropriate in the 1970s. He argues at that time that it is probably impossible to talk about college students in general. He points out that the results of large scale research on American college students accentuate the diversity rather than similarity: "Probably the soundest statement that can be made about college students today is that they are highly diversified."[36] David Gottlieb and Benjamin Hodgkins argue that any assumption of a homogeneous student population is highly questionable, and that the assumption should rather be that the "very heterogeneity of American society results in college student bodies with diverse origins and values within most institutions of higher learning."[37]

When Hodgkinson characterizes the students of the seventies, he calls attention to one of the most significant changes in the collective student body is the increase in numbers. He goes on, however, to say:

> In sum, the American student body has become more diverse in background, more transient, less willing to play higher education's games to get the gold stars that degrees represent, more politically aware and politically powerful, less easily led around by the nose, more aware of the world outside the campus, more willing to take direct action on issues they deem important to their self-interest, less willing to police their fellow students, and less loyal to abstract institutions in the same way that the American voter tends to vote for the man, not for the party. One could also postulate an increasing pragmatism and specificity in the student's attitude about higher education.....This is a more sophisticated college generation, representing a larger range of background, and perhaps of ability, than higher education has ever dealt with before.[38]

And, thus even as writers contend that students in American higher educational institutions are so diverse it is impossible to characterize them in any simple way, they proceed to make generalizations. But, perhaps the most significant generalization is that there is great diversity among the students. But let us review further some recent commentaries.

The popular news magazines in the annual assessments of the college student they have been undertaking, particularly since the sixties, began in 1971 to write about significant changes in the nation's universities. The magazine U. S. News and World Report in October, 1971, headlined a report: "Turn From Campus Violence," and went on with a lengthy subhead: "There's a significant change at the nation's universities. Relative quiet reigns after years of turmoil. Discontent? Yes -- but many students are turning to peaceful means of changing "the system!" The article then described a "new breed" of student that is taking over the campus. The new breed continues to question traditional politics, sexual morals and capitalism, hold meetings, but "no longer, however, do students see America's broad problems as simple afflictions to be solved by a curse, a march or a bombing. And increasingly, the report said, educators find young people are looking 'within the system' for practical solutions to those problems."[39]

This particular article referred to student calm and a new "silent generation" similar to that of the 1950s. Students were described as more serious, and the administration and faculty had become "more vigorous" in the "wielding of authority." The conclusion was: the campuses are serene, the students are more pragmatic and more prepared to work within the system. Some students, however, were reported to differ with the majority estimate and were said to be of the opinion that their fellow students are just discouraged and disillusioned, not cooperative.

Eight months later, the same magazine, in June 1972, again described the "New Mood of College Students." This time the long subhead read: "Violence is ebbing and interest in learning is rising at the nation's universities. Staff members of 'U.S. News and World Report' find many new trends in campus life today." The lead paragraph referred to a "high tide of change" that is "rolling across American college campuses, sweeping away many old issues and leaving students in a fresh mood." The attitudes that were reflected in 1971-1972 were reported by the magazine to be carried over into 1972-1973; the new direction is away from confrontation and violence toward "some kind of working arrangement with the world outside college walls." While some observers were reported to be referring to the new mood as "apathetic" others referred to it as "a mellowing." According to the article some attempts at violent demonstrations during the year simply fizzled. Interest in studies was up, students were working harder, and were even to be found in the library on Saturday night and Sunday afternoon. One administrator referred to "a high academic work ethic."[40]

According to the presidents interviewed by the magazine staff, the college student in 1972-1973 was less radical, more interested in getting an education and a job, more involved in off-campus politics, and was becoming more interested in social life and religion.

And in February, 1974, the same magazine reported "Switch for Student Activists -- Working Inside 'the System'" and makes the sweeping generalization that "college militants by the thousands are moving student crusades from the streets into the political arena -- buttonholing legislators, ringing doorbells and flooding the mails on issues ranging from food costs to conservation." The article goes on to describe a number of specific instances in which student action apparently did bring about changes in legislation and/or practice.[41] And in May, 1974, as we have already noted, the magazine reported on the campus reforms that had come out of the ferment of the sixties.[42]

A similar series of descriptions issued forth from Newsweek. In November, 1972, the magazine referred to "A Separate Peace." And while the education editor of the magazine reported the relative quiet on the campuses, he was initially a bit more cautious than U. S. News and World Report:

> To say that campuses are quiet is not news, for the campuses have been more or less quiet for some two years. More important, though, it is not even accurate. For if the 50's meant obedience, and unquestioning acceptance of the status quo and the simple pleasure of being in college, the 70's are not at all the same. The placid surface conceals tension -- and an uneasiness that in some hard-to-pin-down way gnaws at students, administrators and faculty alike.[43]

As he went on to try to describe the underlying tension, the writer suggested that perhaps college students were a lot less idealistic than many thought, that having won certain concessions related to their own interest, they were now actually little concerned about other developments. With the racial issue less in the limelight, students were attending to it less. Because they were not threatened by the draft, they protested the war situation less. Because jobs were increasingly difficult to get, they were more worried about the job market.

But it was a mixed picture, and "if there is unrest on American campuses at the moment, it is principally with the faculty." It was said that faculty reported a growing lack of respect among students for their teachers and the intellectual process. Faculty were besieged by questions of job security. Higher education in

general was facing public reaction and suspicion. Students were dropping in and dropping out more frequently, and "scores of institutions have revised their curriculums to slice the number of required courses, some have inserted month-long breaks between semesters to allow students to pursue independent study projects; others have developed year-round schedules to save money."[44]

In March, 1974, Newsweek provided a "Campus Snapshot" in which it was said that the decade of the sixties challenged so many aspects of higher education, but now there is silence. The students, the writer observed, seem "to be a study in opposites, combining an intense sense of their private and interior worlds with a most practical view of the prospects before them." It was suggested that students have not lost their idealism, but they had become much more realistic about the world they faced, a world in which jobs were increasingly scarce; the college reflects student reaction in the increased competition for admission into professional fields. The theme throughout the report was that students in 1974 reflected the characteristics of privatism and realism.[45]

Fortune magazine in March, 1973, reported on a survey of six universities, three community colleges and five high schools, in which interviews were conducted with 200 students and more than 100 educators. The theme of that story is that the youth revolution of the sixties has come and gone. The reporters refer to a "new normalcy." In using the term, the writers contend that we were not seeing in 1973 simply a return to the calmness of the fifties but we were experiencing the birth of a new kind of tolerance -- "if any single word sums up the viewpoint of students in 1973, it is tolerance." The story goes on to say that in view of the relative rareness of tolerance, particularly among the young, "the blossoming of tolerance on campus is a phenomenon worth pausing over." The students are described as being "more aware" and better informed" in comparison with the students of the fifties, and the tolerance arises, in part, from "a new awareness that nobody -- young or old -- has all the answers." Such tolerance is a sign of realism rather than of apathy.

The reporters found, however, that this new tolerance leads to such diverse results as increased theft in campus bookstores and increased use of drugs while the students at the same time seem prepared to accept even the essentials of the traditional educational system. The report suggests that one reason many of the parts of the traditional system are accepted is that students have won concessions in a number of areas, including sitting on all types of academic and disciplinary bodies. A majority of the students, the report notes, seem to have specific career goals. And the general mood of seriousness is again noted.[46]

Suggesting a different reason for the tranquility of the seventies, Edgar A. Schick says that many students were simply "burned out" after the tensions of May, 1970, and others may have just given up. He goes on to suggest that the contemporary student has come to realize "that the grand schemes of the past for a sudden and total restructuring of society had failed" and has turned to a less flamboyant, if not less intense, search for ways to make changes in the immediate environment, political or academic. The writer contends that students have developed an increasing interest and sophistication in dealing with the operations of the academic bureaucracy.[47]

Echoing some of the other observations, the Chronicle of Higher Education in November, 1973, carried the headline, "Student Demands for 'Practical' Education Are Forcing Major Changes in Curricula."[48] While the article was directed to a discussion of some of the curricular changes underway, it called attention to what appeared to be a growing preference of students for "practical education that can be put to use immediately" and a demand for "short career-occupational education, a credential, and a job." A subsequent article in the same periodical pointed up the impact of the "new practicality" on the humanities.[49] According to the reporter of that story, students were "abandoning theoretical, abstract, and purely academic fields for those that relate directly to jobs." Enrollments were shown to be down in English and History and the foreign languages, and some faculties were turning

to attempts to develop "applied humanities," to the application of the skills of people in the humanities to interdisciplinary problems wherein the contemporary issues were to be dealt with from a humanistic viewpoint.

But how is this apparently overwhelming practical orientation of students to be squared with what some others see as a new emphasis on religion? Larry Van Dyne of the Chronicle of Higher Education reports on a new reformation, a new spiritualism, a new mysticism, "Call it what you will . . . a new cultural phenomenon is evident among youth."[50] He refers to the campus best sellers -- Castaneda's writings about the Mexican Indian mystic Don Juan, and volumes such as I Ching, Exorcist, Chariots of the Gods -- or the regular appearance on campus of the Hare Krishnas and the mobs following Guru Mahraj Ji, the interest in astrology, and in transcendental meditation. The list goes on.

According to Van Dyne, Paul Goodman in 1969 saw evidence of, and referred to the rise of a new religious sensibility, a New Reformation. Theodore Rozak refers to "a strange, new radicalism abroad which refuses to respect the conventions of secular thought and value, which insists on making the visionary powers a central point of political reference." Andrew Kopkind calls it the "New Mysticism," an outgrowth of the failure of the revolution of the sixties and a response to the pressures of the current scene. David Riesman is quoted as saying that the upper-middle-class young are looking "for something transcendent."

In June, 1973, Change magazine reported interviews with four students at Princeton, who were asked to talk among themselves and with the reporters about "their sense of themselves as students, as people preparing for lives in a complex and difficult world."[51] Phrases and sentences such as the following emerged:

> "...I want to be involved--I want to find out about myself."
>
> "...It's hard to walk by and not put on a red armband if everybody's doing it, and if this is the cause to be protesting. But it doesn't help anying."

> "...I believe we are here in some sense to prepare for making a contribution. And that contribution should have something to do with furthering the stability and happiness and the comfort of life on earth in a broad sense."

But there was also concern for jobs, what they might mean, whether they would be boring, or fulfilling, or creative. The conclusion of one of the editors was that the conversation "at the very least" belied "the charge that students today are self-satisfied and crass, that the idealism that brought the campuses of the sixties to such vibrant life is merely a relic of history."

Virtually the entire issue of Change in October, 1974, was given over to essays written for the magazine by students.[52] One of the contributors described the new student activists and noted that in some two dozen states there were statewide student political organizations "working to guarantee that administrators and politicians hear a student voice."[53] Also undergraduate student governments in 18 states had committed "vast amounts of time and money to a Ralph Nader inspired project, the Public Interest Research Group." The author contended that through these and other activities "hundreds of thousands of college students" had become involved in a new political activism that reflected the idealism and energy of the sixties, but "tempered by the sophisticated and pragmatic politics of the seventies." As if to reinforce this view, a report in an October, 1974, issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education takes note of the efforts of student lobbies in a number of states and in Washington:

> The student lobbies that have appeared in Washington and several state capitals in the last four years are now concentrating much of their energy on trying to hold tuition down, push financial aid up, and secure economic benefits for their constituents.[54]

The lobbies follow conventional tactics, and they apparently are having their share of successes.

But in the seventies there are still the "street people" that were the "flower children" of the sixties. They are, however, according to William A. Sievert _ .

"a wholly different breed from the 'flower children' of the 1960's."[55] They face "a very real poverty" and most of them apparently have sought work, but they are poorly prepared for work and most of them appear to have decided that "making it" in America is "more fantasy than reality."

How does one characterize the student in the 1970s? Popular assessment suggests a degree of quiet and calmness on the campus, but it is a quiet that is different from that of the 1950s. Students are supposed to be as committed as ever, but they seem prepared to work within the system. At the same time that they are characterized as being more concerned about their own personal interests, they are also seen to be more realistic about the way in which the world and the university can be reformed. It is also suggested that some of the activism has been co-opted, and that many of the things that were sought in the 1960s have on the college campus been realized; at least the campus is much more open to variations in life style and objectives.

But there are differences of opinion regarding the quiet state at the universities. Byron Evans, vice-president for student affairs at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute warns against falling into complacency: "Higher education has not returned to the past, nor is it possible."[56] He goes on to say that the "present lull" should not be misunderstood; the revolution has "recessed," but we should "harbor no illusion that it is ended." And we should, according to Evans, begin preparing for the next wave of activism.

Time magazine reported in June, 1974, on conflict at Ohio University with an opening paragraph: "Tranquility has returned to most U.S. campuses, but Ohio University at Athens stands out as a troubled exception. In the past month alone, the campus has been rocked by a strike of student workers, two successive nights of rioting, and demands that President Claude R. Sowle resign." And the President had submitted his resignation with the statement that he could "no longer ask myself or my family to serve the university under such insane conditions."[57]

A special report in the series developed by the American Council on Education from the annual survey of entering freshmen suggested that the class entering in 1969 was more politically polarized than any of the previous three groups surveyed and that more of the group had participated in protest activity in the high school than was the case of any of the preceding entering groups. To the extent this group retained its attitude, the mood to protest was very much present even if not openly expressed during the early 1970s.[58]

Special Studies

In addition to the more or less popular treatments, there have been several more systematic reviews of the American college student. In 1969 the Greenwich College Research Center, Inc., published The College Scene: Students Tell It Like It Is. Based upon numerous personal interviews including more than 100 college campuses, the volume summarized responses to a continuing "College Poll." The data reported in the volume refer to a period up to and through the year 1967. This volume, as do others, emphasizes the difficulty of classifying college students by pointing out that the base of college education has broadened and college students come from an ever widening segment of American society.

The "College Poll" reflects some of the mood of the late 1960s but also seems to agree with statements coming from the more popular reviews in the news magazines already noted above. It is reported that college students do not expect college education to have the immediate or long-term values that parents may expect, and "the cross section of student opinion reflects a growing disbelief that a college education leads either to fulfillment or satisfaction.[59] Yet there is a growing segment of career oriented students. As one reads the report obviously growing out of the mid- and late-sixties, one finds reflections of some of the statements that are being made in the 1970s. It is stated that "the average student goes his or her way to and from class, and to and from meals with little thought of a rumble,

or a riot, and probably little interest in direct action of any kind to affectuate change in the college administration."[60] And it is noted that most students have never taken part in a demonstration of any kind, let alone a riot. Most of the students are reported to be against violence of any kind in bringing about changes in the university. The report observed that across the country the campus scene is "remarkably quiet," at a time just preceeding 1970, when the events at Kent State would bring what Clark Kerr terms "the involvement of students and institutions in protest in greater number than ever before in history." The report predicted that the newly enfranchised voters may have a deciding impact on the election of 1972, but as has already been noted, the impact of the student voters was apparently quite limited.

What one gains from a review of The College Scene is a picture of the majority of students on campus concerned that some changes take place in organization and curriculum, but surprisingly satisfied with most of what they find, out of sympathy with the dissenters, and more inclined to allow things to continue as they are than to become directly involved in effecting radical changes.

One finds a similar view in Hodgkinson's data in Institutions in Transition. While he refers to a "new kind" of student, based upon questionnaire responses from 1,230 presidents of institutions of higher education in 1968-1969 the students do not appear to be suggesting radical changes. Some 20 percent of the presidents indicate an increase in the percentage of graduates completing their degree requirements. Almost three-quarters of those reporting indicate that the percent of the graduating class planning on further education has gone up. The percent of freshmen who go on to complete degree requirements had gone up in half of the institutions. There was some indication that students have become more involved in establishing and enforcing regulations and in controlling academic and institution wide policies; in each instance well over half of the presidents reported more student participation or involvement in these areas.[61]

Both the report in The College Scene and in Hodgkinson's book deal with students in the mid- and late 1960s. In some respects both sets of responses are outdated. For example, Hodgkinson's report that more students are planning on more education may be questioned in the light of data in 1973 showing some decrease in the percent of high school students indicating they plan to enter college.[62]

During 1969-1970 the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education sponsored a survey of academic opinion involving 70,000 undergraduates, 30,000 graduate students and 60,000 faculty members. The results of the survey were reported in several publications of the Commission as well as the Chronicle of Higher Education.[63] Two-thirds of the undergraduate students responded that they were "satisfied" or "very satisfied with college, and 77 percent of the graduate students signified satisfaction with their programs. Yet, while generally satisfied overall with college, faculty relations, relations with other students and the quality of classroom instruction, some 90 percent of the undergraduates indicated that course work should be "more relevant to contemporary life and problems." Undergraduates disagreed with faculty in that more than half of them indicated they favored "making all courses elective, abolishing grades, and giving faculty members and students complete control of the universities. Most faculty members opposed those ideas."[64]

Some 20 percent of the undergraduates indicated that students should be able to vote on faculty appointments, course content and degree requirements, but only 5 percent of the faculty agreed, and only 15 percent of the faculty agreed that students should be consulted on such matters. The majority of undergraduates (62 percent) graduate students (72 percent) and faculty (79 percent) agreed that "students who disrupt the functioning of a college should be expelled or suspended, but only 21 percent of the undergraduates agreed that "student demonstrations have no place on a college campus.

"Longitudinal" Studies

Two national studies that have the advantage of providing trend data are those that have been conducted since 1965 and 1967 by the Daniel Yankelovich opinion research firm and the study of American college freshmen begun in 1966 by Alexander Astin. Yankelovich's first study was begun in 1965 and published by the Institute of Life Insurance. In the fall of 1967 the Yankelovich organization undertook a nationwide survey of college students for Fortune magazine which explored student values with regard to love, marriage, religion, work, saving, success, drugs, technology, authority and career choice. In 1969 the Fortune survey was updated at the request of CBS News. In 1970 the organization was commissioned by John D. Rockefeller III to undertake a new study, and in 1971 the J.D.R. 3rd Fund requested a further study. Most recently, in 1973 the organization conducted a similar study for five private foundations, including the J.D.R. 3rd Fund and the Carnegie Corporation. The latter study involved interviews with 3,522 persons in a national sampling of both college and non-college youth.[65]

In reporting the 1969 study, the Yankelovich researchers noted that the so-called generation gap represented a half-truth. It was observed that while college students held views different from those of their parents, "their values conflicted even more sharply with the values of other young people in their own generation who were not attending college." The study concluded that the gap within the generation was greater than the gap between generations and that there was indeed a "strong bond of shared core values between parents and their college-age children."[66]

In the 1969 study there was considerable evidence that the campus was becoming highly politicized, and although a small proportion of the students were characterized as out-and-out revolutionaries (3 percent), a large proportion, approximately 40 percent of the students shared the criticisms made by the revolutionaries.

The 1970 study focused upon the conflict between college youth and the so-called Establishment and revealed "a surprisingly large core of common concerns shared by the business executives and college students."[67] However, the study also pointed up "an awesome collection of obstacles, both practical and psychological, that stood in the way of productive Youth/Establishment collaboration." The report showed a sharp increase in college student mistrust, alienation and despair.

In 1971, a change in mood appeared. The 1971 study included hour-long personal interviews with more than 1,200 college students in 53 colleges and universities throughout the country. And it did appear that significant changes had taken place on the campus. The study suggested that there was a beginning of a separation between radical political values and life-style values in 1971. That is to say, whereas radical political and radical life-style values were found together in the mid-1960s, in 1971 the changing cultural values became even more pronounced while the political values appeared to be moving toward a more tolerant mood. Students in 1971 appeared to be less critical of the major institutional forms, the political parties, business, universities, the union, and the like. There appeared to be even further movement in this separation in 1973.

The 1971 study also noted a move away from the mood of personal despair and depression. It suggests that "the best single phrase describing the current student mood is, <u>confused but not despairing</u>."[68] While being less despairing about their own personal lives, students were no more optimistic about society in general. To the contrary, more of them were of the opinion that American society was sick than was the case of the previous years.

By 1973 the students seemed even more prepared to accept or at least work within the established political lines; in 1971 some 57 percent identified with the Republican or Democratic party, while in 1973 some 73 percent identified themselves with one of the two major parties. And in 1973 the students apparently even developed more confidence in society: in 1971 45 percent had referred to American society as a sick society, while in 1973 only 35 percent so identified it.[69]

The 1971 report referred to changing moral codes and "surprising contrast" in what students viewed as morally right or wrong. For example, it pointed out that more students considered it more immoral to collect welfare when one was capable of working than it was to pay one's way through college by selling dope. And pilferage was considered more immoral than destroying private property, selling dope, interchanging partners among couples, and general disregard of the law. By 1973, the percentage of college students who disapproved of casual premarital sex had dropped from 34 percent to 22 percent and disapproval of homosexual relations had dropped from 42 percent to 25 percent.

In 1971 some 55 percent of the students said that campus radicalism was leveling off or declining, whereas only 33 percent so declared in 1970. In 1973 an even smaller proportion saw campus rebellion as a significant factor, and an increasing number of students indicated that it was morally wrong to use violence even in a good cause.

The study also found that many of the non-college youth had shifted opinions and were at approximately the same point at which the college population was some five years ago.

Since 1966 the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, under the direction of Alexander Astin has been surveying the entering freshmen in a large sample of American higher educational institutions. From 1966 to 1970 his sample included approximately 15 percent of the colleges and universities in the United States. From 1971 the Program invited all institutions with entering freshmen classes and who complete the Office of Education HEGIS forms to participate. Although items and wording have changed somewhat since the study was begun, it is instructive to compare the responses of freshmen in 1966 with those in the most recently published summary report, the report for 1973.[70]

If one compares the profile of freshmen entering in 1966 with the group entering in 1973, one finds some striking differences even in this brief span of time.

In all geographical regions fewer students in 1966 indicated they planned to seek no degree than was the case in 1973. The greatest differences were in the Midwest and West. In 1966 some 7.7 percent of entering freshmen reported seeking no degree, but only 4.7 percent so reported in 1973. The differences in the Midwest were 6.2 percent and 3.1 percent, respectively. In all regions there were increases in the percentage of students planning on medical degrees; the greatest difference was from 4.6 in the Midwest in 1966 to 9.4 percent in the Midwest in 1973. Law was also more popular, from less than 2.0 percent in 1966 to over 4.0 percent in all regions in 1973. There were also increases in all regions but the East in the percentage considering the Ph.D.

Comparing the profiles over a shorter period of time, but using an available summary of the data for the class entering in fall, 1974, and a summary for the group entering in fall, 1969, we find the same pattern of increase in aspirations for the professional post-baccalaureate degrees. However, with the entering class in 1974 we find a slight increase in the percentage of students reporting planning no degree (3.9 percent) in 1974 and 2.0 percent in 1969.[71] This percentage is also slightly higher in 1974 than in 1973.

In 1966, business was the area most often designated as the probable field of study (except in the East). In 1973, business was by far the most popular field among freshmen in all regions, ranging from 19.0 percent in the East to 16.1 percent in the Midwest. In 1966 education and engineering were high in the list of choices. In 1973 education was the second most popular field and higher in all regions than in 1966; it was surprisingly higher in the South, from 8.2 percent in 1966 to 13.7 percent in 1973. Engineering, the second highest in 1966, was clearly down in all regions in 1973.

In 1974, business was still ranked highest as the probable field of study. Education was still in second rank, but it had fallen from 12.2 percent in 1973 to 10.5 percent in 1974. Health professions, ranking third in 1973 (10.4 percent)

was in fourth place (7.5 percent) with "technical fields" now increasing in popularity from 5.3 percent to 7.7 percent.

In indicating probable occupations, the freshmen in 1966 placed secondary education at the top in almost all regions: it was strikingly lower in 1973, from over 17.0 percent in one region in 1966 to 5.0 percent, or less, in all regions in 1973. On the other hand, business as a probable occupation increased considerably in all regions by 1973. The percentage of students indicating medicine or law as probable occupations was somewhat higher in 1973 than in 1966. Engineering had dropped considerably from 1966 to 1973. Perhaps most significant is that more persons (from 10.8 percent to 12.0 percent) were undecided about occupation in 1973 than in 1966 (from 3.6 percent to 4.7 percent).

In 1974, the percentage of entering students reporting "undecided" for probable career occupation had further increased -- from 11.2 percent in all regions combined in 1973 to 12.4 percent in 1974. The percentage of students indicating "college education," "secondary education," and "elementary educator" decreased in each category; the decrease was greatest for "elementary educator," from 4.2 percent in all regions combined in 1973 to 3.5 percent in 1974.

Whether indicative of any general trend or not, it should be noted that in 1966, from 4.4 percent (South) to 9.6 percent (West) of the entering freshmen reported "none" under religious preference, while in 1973 the proportion increased to 8.3 percent (South) to 13.6 percent (West). The overall percentage did not change appreciably between 1973 and 1974. Still "to develop a philosophy of life" was the objective considered an essential or very important goal by well over two-thirds of the entering freshmen in 1973; this statement as an option did not appear in the 1966 questionnaire. The next most important goal in 1973 was to "help others in difficulty";nearly two-thirds of the entering students checked this as an essential or very important goal. A higher proportion (well over two-thirds in each region) designated this goal in 1966 as essential or very important.

The third essential or very important goal in 1973 was to "be an authority in my field." A slightly higher proportion in each region indicated this to be an important goal in 1966. A considerably higher proportion of students in 1973 checked to "be well-off financially" as an essential or very important goal in 1973 (well over 52 percent in 1973 in each region compared with as low as 39.1 percent in the Midwest in 1966).

What shall we conclude? What is the mood of the American college student in the mid-1970s? It is perhaps dangerous to over-generalize, because we know that as higher educational institutions have broadened the base of enrollment, the term "college student" has come to embrace persons with a wide range of background, interest, abilities. Perhaps, however, it is possible to refer to a more or less prevailing mood. The various surveys, for all of their limitations, are fairly consistent in indicating that for the time being college students generally are prepared to use means other than direct confrontation to secure changes deemed important. The surveys also suggest that there have been significant changes in the operation and outlook of colleges, that reforms instituted in the 1960s have had an impact upon college campuses. But the reforms are not isolated happenings on college campuses. In many ways the campuses either reflect or anticipate changes in general societal values. The generation gap seems considerably more narrow than has been assumed, and basic values of students, while significant variations on older themes, are not as radically different from those of their parents as some have suggested.

At the present time the majority of the students seem disinclined to advance their interests through the kind of disruption that reached many campuses during the late 1960s. But to suggest that apathy reigns as is commonly noted by many observers, is an oversimplification. Students have not simply returned to the spirit of the fifties; they have developed their own commitments, and they are involved in campus-wide decision-making to a greater degree than ever before.

And, life on campus is not without its tensions and problems. College students, at least the majority of them, are still young adults or just becoming young adults. They are not wholly consistent -- and their elders are not always as consistent as they sometimes think themselves to be. The students have their ideals, and yet it would be a mistake to attribute to them more wisdom and insight than they have. There was some tendency during the 1960s to romanticize the efforts of activist students and to attribute to them higher motives, greater intelligence, more dedication and greater insight than they deserved. This is not to depreciate the efforts; it is simply to ask for more sense of perspective.

If anything has come out of the experience of the past decade, it should be that college faculty and administrators cannot and should not take students for granted. There are some observers who are already decrying what appears to be a new apathy. But before deciding that life has settled back into a dull and drab routine and that there is little hope for the future, we need to reflect upon the assessment of the observers and the experts in the early 1960s. Calvin Lee refers to a statement of Clark Kerr in 1959. In looking forward into the sixties, Kerr said: "I could just see.....that they are not going to press many grievances..... they are going to do their jobs, they are going to be easy to handle. There aren't going to be riots. There aren't going to be revolutions. There aren't going to be many strikes."[72] Lee observes, and in retrospect we are all aware, how wrong Kerr was. And yet as Lee points out, "no educator in his wildest moments would have guessed what the decade of the Sixties would bring to Berkeley in particular and American higher education in general."[73] Even Kenneth Keniston, while he saw pressures for change in society, characterized the students in the late fifties in terms of a lack of rebelliousness, a widespread feeling of powerlessness, a kind of primitivism with an accent upon the present, without much in the way of political involvement but committed to the cult of experience.[74]

All of which is not to suggest that because campuses seem relatively quiet in the 1970s that we of necessity face another series of outbreaks in the late 1970s. It is only to reiterate that the students should not be taken for granted and that faculty and administration should make greater and continuing efforts to initiate and maintain a kind of dialogue that will make for more positive approach to the future. Particularly, individual institutions need to be more aware of the kind of students there are on the campus, indeed of the mood of a particular campus. They need to be more realistic about the interests and needs of the students and the possibilities within the institution. What an institution announces itself to be or intends to be should reflect realistically the kinds of students attracted to and available in the institution. It is all too easy to generate an image that fails to reflect the actual state of affairs. One may, for example, refer to the need for increasing selectivity of students and emphasizing a more traditional view of the liberal arts while the students being admitted are primarily oriented to practical and professional pursuits. What the students are committed to and what the institution purports to be ought to be much closer together.

In the years to come institutions will also be seeking to work out means of accommodating an increasing proportion of women students and minority students. While the proportion attending higher educational institutions from among the male white students is declining, the proportion of women and of minority students has been increasing. Reports on enrollments for the fall, 1974, show that the number of women enrolling had increased by 7.7 percent over 1973, while the enrollment of men increased by only 3.8 percent, and it was noted:

> The accelerating growth can be attributed largely to the presence of more women on the campuses. Among both full-time and part-time students in almost every kind of institution, the number of women has grown faster than that of their male classmates.[75]

And while minorities generally increased in the enrollment, there were some who were of the opinion that minority enrollments might not continue to increase

significantly.[76] One study showed a proportional decrease.[77] The recent case of Marco de Funis, who sued the University of Washington because he had been refused a place in the law school class of 1974 while applicants with poorer scores and academic records were admitted because they were members of minority groups brought a question to the fore, but the Supreme Court in effect decided not to deal with the issue, since in the meantime de Funis did manage to secure his degree. But the question of differential treatment toward minorities and other groups will continue to be one of considerable concern to colleges and universities, and the resolution will be a matter of considerable discussion and debate in the months and years to come. The campuses may not be torn asunder by outbreaks of violence, but they will not necessarily be calm and unperturbed.

New Types of Students?

In an address at the annual meeting of the American Association for Higher Education in 1973 Patricia Cross pointed out that although higher education was never designed to educate the masses, most high school students can now enter college; over 75 percent of those in the upper half of the high school do enroll.[78] She draws the conclusion that "a group of young people whom we used to dismiss as 'not college material' are now walking through the open doors of colleges," and she goes on to say that these students "constitute a growing proportion of the college population."[79] Pointing out, however, that remedial programs have not been particularly successful, she asks for restructuring the college curriculum on a "problem-oriented" base and clearer differentiation in goals among colleges. She picks up the same theme in an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education.[80] In the latter piece she argues for developing the educational program on three dimensions -- specific knowledge (the traditional focus), interpersonal skills, and the ability to work with things. In short, she is saying that the college population in the mid-1970s is different; we have new kinds of students, and we need new kinds of programs.

In one of the initial papers in the set prepared for the Fifty-third Annual Meeting of the American Council on Higher Education, Todd Furniss reminds us that "There is no collective American educational community, but rather several thousand essentially independent public, private, and commercial institutions, each with a set of educational programs finite in number, capacity, materials, facilities, and other dimensions."[81] And Patricia Cross is asking that within this wide range of institutional types provision be made for a broader range of student abilities and interests. Furniss also notes that institutions, particularly the large public institutions, having admitted an increasingly diverse population, now discover "that if the students are to benefit, new educational programs are required."[82] Up to this time, however, most institutional responses have been on an ad hoc basis; much more planning is called for and much, much more money is needed.

Both Cross and Furniss are addressing an issue that may be more properly considered in a treatise on curriculum development, but it is mentioned in the context of this monograph in relation to the kinds of students colleges are attracting and can attract. The generalizations about the contemporary student in the foregoing section of this paper must be examined in the light of the clientele a particular institution attracts.

There is a considerable body of literature on "open access," "remedial work," and "disadvantaged students." We intend to touch on some of these items in the monograph on curriculum trends rather than to increase the scope of this already long review. There are, however, two other topics that should at least be mentioned in this section, the "older student" and the "market" for college graduates.

Engin Holmstrom reports on a special aspect of the annual survey of entering freshmen conducted by the American Council on Education, the experience of the "older" freshman. Using data from the 1967 entering class and a follow-up on the group in 1971, Holmstrom found that older students (20 years or older as entering freshmen) made lower grade-point averages (except in two-year colleges) included

more who planned to get no more than a baccalaureate, and fewer attained a baccalaureate in four years. The older students came in larger proportions from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds, tended to enroll in public rather than private institutions and in smaller or less selective institutions. Yet older students who enrolled in highly selective institutions were more likely to complete the baccalaureate than were those older students enrolled in other types of institutions.[83] It was also noted that:

> Older students were somewhat different from average-age students in their attitudes and life goals, but some of the differences were not consistent and varied by type of institution in which .....(they) were initially enrolled. Generally, more of the older.....students agreed that the major benefit of a college education is monetary. Further, older students were more favorable to open admissions.....[84]

In the ACE survey for 1967 only 4.9 percent of the entering students were aged 20 or above, but more than half of these were older than 21 years.

The report of the Carnegie Commission on alternative channels to life, work and service calls for "more opportunities in colleges for part-time and for adult students," but raises the question of whether older adults will mix well with youth.

> They (older adults) may be handicapped by less inclination toward theory and by less retentive memories, but they will often bring greater motivation and more judgment based upon experience. The GI's after World War II were excellent students and raised the level of academic effort of all students. They were, however, only a few years older than other students.[85]

Strictly speaking, if one uses the age of 21 as marking "adulthood" -- even though the 26th amendment brought the lowering of the age of majority in many states, as the Carnegie Commission points out, about 42 percent of all students on colleges and university campuses are adults.[86] And, by 1972 some 19.7 percent of the students were 25 years or older.[87] Yet, <u>for the traditional on-campus, full-time program</u>, even with the increases in the age range of students, the majority of the students are still in the late teens and early twenties. As institutions, colleges and universities are probably moving toward a "new kind of student," but they are

doing so slowly -- and at the undergraduate level, at least, the pattern of instruction is geared to what faculty think is appropriate to the younger adult.

It is when we look to the special evening programs, the adult education sector, and the so-called nontraditional and broader "postsecondary" programs that we are likely to find more evidence of the presence of the new kind of student, insofar as "older" identifies the new student. The Carnegie Commission reported on data from the Current Population Survey of May 1969 and the survey conducted under the sponsorship of the Commission on Non-Traditional Study in 1972. The Population Survey revealed that among persons 35 years old and over and among those 17 to 34 years of age not enrolled in "regular" school full-time, some 13.2 million (or 11.0 percent of 119.7 million "eligible" adults) had participated in some kind of schooling the year before. The Commission on Non-Traditional Study found that an estimated 32.1 million persons 18 to 60 years of age (or 30.9 percent of 104 million "eligible" adults) had received instruction during the previous year in "evening classes, extension courses, on-the-job training, private lessons, independent study, T.V. courses....."[88]

The Carnegie Commission went on to estimate that 57 million persons -- mainly adults -- were engaged in some kind of postsecondary education and training activity during the year and that of this group some 8.9 million constitute those in degree-credit work in traditional programs. Clearly, those engaged in some kind of study outside of traditional higher education constitute a remarkably large portion of society.

The National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education describes the "postsecondary education enterprise" of 1972-73 as consisting of 2,948 "collegiate" institutions, 7,016 "noncollegiate institutions," 3,500 "other" postsecondary institutions and an unnumbered range of "other learning activities." The total number of persons involved, outside of the "collegiate" and "noncollegiate" sectors is, according to the Commission, very difficult to estimate, and data on age composition are even more difficult to come by:

> Current data on the age composition of postsecondary enrollment are even less conclusive. On the one hand, there has been a good deal of discussion.....of the need to accommodate increasing numbers of older students in line with the concept of lifelong learning, the need for retaining, and the acceptance of greater numbers of students for part-time enrollment.....(But) there are no national time series data on the age distribution of postsecondary enrollment to show (trends).....Surveys by the Office of Education show that part-time collegiate enrollments fell from 30 percent between 1961 and 1971. But part-time enrollment is expected to rise again to 36 percent by 1980.[89]

Just how the undergraduate college, particularly the private and church-related undergraduate college will relate to these developments in the larger realm of "postsecondary education" is not clear. That there is a potential clientele among "older" adults and for programs outside of the "traditional" in terms of time, place and content seems evident. How a particular college relates to this new clientele, to these "new kinds of students" is fairly much a matter of that institution's orientation and imagination: the new clientele is not automatically available or interested.

Several presentations during the Twenty-ninth National Conference on Higher Education in March, 1974, dealt with the growth of the non-traditional sector and "recurrent education" as the term is being used in Europe. James R. Goss, Director of the Center for Educational Research and Innovation, OECD, documented the growth of part-time training and evening classes in Europe. He noted that while much effort is being expended in "upper secondary education" more of the effort is in industry and in the "educational leave of absence."[90] James O'Toole of the University of Southern California outlined the need for developing opportunities for the disadvantaged, elderly, blue collar workers, middle-class men and women. He pointed out that "increasing numbers of people are demanding greater choice in the form of education." They are requesting "self-mastery courses, and flexible time schedules, and on-the-job and in-the-field training." They also want "a greater range of curricular content.....greater flexibility from their jobs.....freedom to drop out of school and into work, out of work and into school."[91] Dorothy Gilford

updated information on the growth of the noncollegiate sector. She indicated that between 1969 and 1972 there was an increase of 20.7 percent in the number of participants in adult education; in 1957 one of each 13 "eligible" adults participated in adult education, in 1969 it was one in 9, and in 1972 it had become 1 in 8.[92]

The Job Market

The job market for college graduates is a recurring subject for discussion in the literature. While, as John Folger points out, we have a bad record in predicting shortages and surpluses of educated personnel in America, the current confused market has prompted more than the average number of commentaries.[93] Headlines such as that in the Chronicle of Higher Education, "College Graduates Seen Exceeding Demand by 10 Percent Between 1980 and 1985" have become commonplace.[94] But references to particular academic disciplines are calculated to be even more sobering as, for example, "Academic Job-Outlook Bleak for Ph.D's in English."[95] Magarrell's story on the excess of college graduates notes that on the basis of data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, between 1972 and 1980 some 8.8 million graduates will be competing for 8.7 million job openings, and between 1980 and 1985, there will be 6.5 million graduates competing for 5.8 million openings.

Folger suggests several reasons for the poor showing in projecting job needs: (1) some estimates have put too much emphasis on the immediate job market; (2) long range projections have depended too much on linear trend projections of past relationships; (3) there has been an assumption of a much closer relationship than actually exists between training and actual occupations entered; (4) there has been little connection between educational planning and manpower needs; (5) projections have not taken into account qualitative changes in higher education that will be needed to meet changing requirements for jobs.[96] In his own review he identifies as the broad trends for the future: (1) the trend toward more employment in service activities, particularly in government (local, state, national) service

employment; (2) professional employment, except in elementary and secondary teaching, will double its pace in employment; the health professions, computer and computer-related professions, social service occupations will grow rapidly.[97] He finds, however, shifts in degree preferences in college do not seem closely related to the job market, and he points out that the job opportunities for college graduates will be outside of the traditional professions; they will be concentrated in government administrative and management fields, business management, sales, advertising, and other service industries.[98] He points out that it will not be a case of unemployed college graduates, but rather a question of where they will find jobs. The key will be flexibility and generality.

In December, 1974, a survey undertaken by Frank S. Endicott, former placement director at Northwestern University, suggested that businesses expected to employ seven percent more women degree-recipients in the coming year than in the previous year; but the increase among men would only be on the order of one percent. The study was among 160 companies, and while there would be an increase among women employed, women would still constitute about 17 percent of baccalaureate-degree recipients employed.[99] The number of jobs available seemed in December to be holding steady, or increasing.

In January, 1975, the job picture had become less optimistic. The College Placement Council had served a larger group of employees, some 700, and found that overall this group planned to employ four percent fewer graduates in 1974-1975 than they did the previous year.[100] Interestingly enough, the only area of increased demand was in engineering, up 10 percent for bachelor-degree-holders and up 7 percent for master-degree-holders. (The CPC survey covered all degree holders; Endicott's survey included only bachelor-degree-holders.) It was further noted that the demand for persons with degrees at all levels in the sciences, mathematics, and other technical fields was down 12 percent from last year. For business degrees the demand was down 11 percent, and for other non-technical fields,

down 3 percent. But the survey also found increases in job offers to women, as did Endicott's survey -- up 34 percent for women with bachelor's degrees and up 15 percent for women with master's degrees.

Other Observations

A study reported in late 1974 provided some new insights on attrition rates. Following a large sample of college students in 10 years since they were freshmen, the American Council on Education found that 77 percent had received their bachelor's degrees within that decade.[101] The study was based on questionnaires returned in 1971 by 24,590 persons who had been college freshmen in 1961. Other findings were: only six percent had apparently given up on seeking a degree; nearly 53 percent completed the degree requirements in four years: more than half of those who had received baccalaureates had enrolled in some kin of graduate or professional study, and 21.6 percent had received master's degrees.

One of the developments in late 1974 with potentially far-reaching consequences was the passage of the amendment to the Elementary-Secondary Act sponsored by Senator James L. Buckley of New York. The amendment provided that parents of elementary and secondary students and at the postsecondary level, the students themselves, should have access to all official records, files, data directly related to the students "that is incorporated into each student's cumulative record folder, and intended for school use outside the school or school system."[102] Institutions were given 45 days to comply with the provision. Reaction was swift and almost frenzied. One move sought to postpone the law from taking effect until July, 1975. And, in the light of the problems that surfaced, Senator Buckley announced he would introduce further provisions that would provide that all records compiled prior to September 20, 1974 would remain confidential.

In December, 1974, the amendment was modified through an attachment to a bill calling for a White House Conference on Library Sciences in 1977.[103] The modifications denied students access to confidential letters and recommendations placed in the files before January 1, 1975. The action also permitted students to waive their rights of access to future confidential recommendations, denied direct access to medical, psychiatric or similar records, guaranteed parents of dependent students the right to information on grades and such, and denied access to records kept by law-enforcement officers under certain conditions.

Notes

[1]Calvin Lee, The Campus Scene, 1900-1970: Changing Styles in Undergraduate Life (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1970), p. 109.

[2]Ibid., pp. 108, 109.

[3]Richard E. Peterson and John A. Bilorsky, May 1970: The Campus Aftermath of Cambodia and Kent State (Berkeley: The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971), p. xi.

[4]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Dissent and Disruption: Proposals for Consideration by the Campus (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971), p. 29.

[5]Ibid., p. 103.

[6]The President's Commission on Campus Unrest, Campus Unrest: The Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970).

[7]"Switch for Student Activists -- Working Inside 'the System'", U. S. News and World Report, (February 4, 1974), p. 68.

[8]Kermet Lanser, "Campus Snapshot," Newsweek, (March 11, 1974), p. 32.

[9]Jack Magarrell, "'Startling Shifts' Found in Youths' Views of Work Morals," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (May 28, 1974), p. 3. Quotes from study by Daniel Yankelovich.

[10]Robert E. Karsten, "A Classification of Interpretations of the Causes and Meanings of Campus Disturbance," (unpubliched Ph.D. dissertation, University of Denver, 1972).

[11]Harold A. Korn and Edward E. Sampson, Student Activism and Protest (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970), p. ix.

[12]Robert E. Karsten, "A Classification of Interpretations of the Causes and Meanings of Campus Disturbance," op. cit., pp. 436-437.

[13]S. L. Halleck, "Twelve Hypotheses of Student Unrest," Stress and Campus Response: Current Issues in Higher Education, 1968, edited by G. Kerry Smith. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968), pp. 115-133.

[14]Donald R. Brown, "Student Activism and Developmental Stress," Student Activism and Protest, op. cit., pp. 89-116.

[15]Ibid., pp. 92-94.

[16]Quoted in Calvin Lee, The Campus Scene, op. cit., p. 108.

[17]Edward E. Sampson, "Student Activism in a Decade of Protest," Student Activism and Protest, op. cit., p. 4.

[18]Kenneth Keniston, "Sources of Student Dissent," Student Activism and Protest, op. cit., p. 169.

[19]John Horn and Paul Knott, "Activist Youth of the 1960's: Summary and Prognosis," Science, 171 (March 12, 1971), pp. 977-985.

[20]Larry C. Kerpelman, "The Radical Activists: Natural Elite?" Chronicle of Higher Education, VII (March 26, 1973), p. 16.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Richard E. Peterson and John A. Bilorsky, May 1970, op. cit., pp. 50-51.

[23]Ibid., p. 52.

[24]Cf. Richard E. Peterson, "The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1967-68" (Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1968) and "The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1964-65" (Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1966).

[25]John Horn and Paul Knott, "Activist Youth of the 1960's: Summary and Prognosis," op. cit., p. 978.

[26]James W. Trent, "Revolution, Reformation, and Reevaluation," Student Activism and Protest, op. cit., p. 29.

[27]Richard E. Peterson, "The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1967-68," op. cit., and "The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1964-65," op. cit.

[28]Richard E. Peterson and John A. Bilorsky, May 1970, op. cit., p. 80.

[29]The President's Commission on Campus Unrest, Campus Unrest, op. cit., p. 185

[30]Fred Hechinger, "Students of the Sixties: Salvaging the Youth Movement," Change, 5 (June, 1973), p. 30.

[31]Ibid., p. 32.

[32]Ibid., pp. 34-35.

[33]"A Report Card on All Those Campus Reforms of the 60s," U. S. News and World Report, 76 (May 6, 1974), pp. 29-40.

[34]Stephen Weissman, "No Retreat from Commitment," The Nation, 216 (June 18,1973).

[35]Harold L. Hodgkinson, Institutions in Transition (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), pp. 26-33.

[36]Nevitt Sanford, "The College Student in the World Today," The College Student and His Culture: An Analysis, edited by Kaoru Yamamoto (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968), p. 131.

[37]David Gottlieb and Benjamin Hodgkins, "College Student Subcultures," The College Student and His Culture: An Analysis, op. cit., p. 238.

[38]Harold L. Hodgkinson, Institutions in Transition, op. cit., pp. 14-15.

[39]"Turn from Campus Violence," U. S. News and World Report, 71 (October 25,1971), pp. 40-43.

[40]"New Mood of College Students," U. S. News and World Report, 72 (June 19, 1972), pp. 28-36.

[41]"Switch for Student Activists -- Working Inside 'The System'," U. S. News and World Report, 76 (February 4, 1974), p. 68.

[42]"A Report Card on All Those Campus Reforms of the '60s," op. cit.

[43]Jerrold K. Footlick, "On Campus: A Separate Peace," Newsweek, (November 6, 1972), p. 108.

[44]Ibid., p. 114.

[45]Kermet Lanser, "Campus Snapshort," op. cit.

[46]Edward Laltermayer, "Youth After 'The Revolution'," Fortune, 87 (March, 1973), pp. 145-158.

[47]Edgar B. Schick, "Campus Ferment and Tranquility, A70-71," School and Society, 100 (February, 1972), p. 94.

[48]Beverly T. Wakins, "Student Demands for 'Practical' Education Are Forcing Major Changes in Curricula," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (November 26, 1973), p. 2.

[49]Malcolm G. Scully, "Student Focus on Practicality Hits Humanities," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (February 4, 1974), pp. 1, 3.

[50]Larry Van Dyne, "5 Analyze New Religious Element in Youth Movements," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (December 3, 1973), p. 6.

[51]"What Really Matters?" Change, 5 (June, 1973), p. 38.

[52]"Student Voices, 1974, on Work, Love, Politics," Change, 6 (October, 1974), pp. 13 ff.

[53]Al Senia, "The New Student Activists," Change, 6 (October, 1974), p. 29.

[54]Larry Van Dyne, "Student Lobbists Shift Emphasis," Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (October 15, 1974), pp. 1, 4.

[55]William A. Sievert, "New Breed of Street People," Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (December 2, 1974), p. 3.

[56]Byron F. Evans, "Today's Quite Campus: Is It Just a Lull in the Revolution?" Current, 151 (May, 1973), p. 46.

[57]"Troubles at Ohio U.," Time, (June 3, 1974), p. 46.

[58]Alan E. Bayer, et al. "Social Issues and Protest Activity: Recent Student Trends," Research Reports, Vol. 5, No. 2, American Council on Education (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970).

[59]James A. Foley and Robert K. Foley, The College Scene: Students Tell It Like It is (New York: Cowles Book Company, Inc., 1969), p. 6.

[60]Ibid., pp. 49-50.

[61]Harold Hodgkinson, Institutions in Transition, op. cit., Passim.

[62]Cf. U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, College Plans of High School Seniors, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, no. 252, August, 1973 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973).

[63]Cf. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Reform on Campus: Changing Students, Changing Academic Programs (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1972); Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The Purposes and the Performance of Higher Education in the United States (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973); Philip W. Semas, "Students 'Satisfied' with Education, Most of Them and Teachers Agree," Chronicle of Higher Education, V (January 18, 1971), pp. 1-2.

[64]Philip W. Semas, "Students 'Satisfied' with Education," op. cit., p. 1.

[65]Cf. The Changing Values on Campus: Political and Personal Attitudes of Today's College Students. A Survey for the JDR 3rd Fund by Daniel Yankelovich, Inc. (New York: Washington Square Press, 1972); John Magarrell, "'Startling Shifts' Found in Youths' Views of Work, Morals," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (May 28, 1974); Daniel Yankelovich, "Counterculture vs. Conservatism," The Denver Post, (February 18, 1973), p. 37.

[66]The Changing Values on Campus, op. cit., p. 5.

[67]Ibid., p. 6.

[68]Ibid., p. 8.

[69]John Magarrell, "'Startling Shifts' Found in Youths' Views of Work, Morals," op. cit.

[70]Cf. Alexander Astin, et al., "Supplementary Norms for Freshmen Entering College in 1966," American Council on Education Research Reports, Vol. 2, no. 3. (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967), and Alexander Astin, et al., "The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall, 1973," Cooperative Institutional Research Program of the University of California at Los Angeles (Los Angeles: Graduate School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, 1974) and Alan E. Bayer, et al., "Four Years After Entry," American Council on Education Research Reports, Vol. 8, no. 1. (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1973.)

[71]Cf. "A Profile of This Year's Freshmen," Chronicle of Higher Education, IV (January 5,1970), p. 2 and "This Year's College Freshmen," Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (January 20, 1975), p. 8.

[72]Calvin Lee, The Campus Scene, op. cit., p. 108.

[73]Ibid.

[74]Kenneth Kiniston, "Social Change and Youth in America," Daedalus, 91 (Winter, 1962), pp. 155-160, passim.

[75]"Half Million More Students: Women Dominate Fall Enrollment Increase," Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (December 16, 1974), p. 2

[76]"Minorities on the Campus: Their Involvement 'In Serious Jeopardy'?" Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (October 29, 1974), p. 3.

[77]"Black Men in College: Their Representation Drops 2 Years in Row," Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (January 13, 1975), p. 3.

[78]But,it should be noted that in 1972 only about one-half of the high school graduates entered college the same year they were graduated. Cf. U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, College Plans of High School Seniors, October 1972. Current Population Reports: Population Characteristics, Series P-20, No. 252, August, 1973. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 4.

[79]K. Patricia Cross, "New Students in a New World," The Future in the Making: Current Issues in Higher Education, 1973, edited by Dykman W. Vermilye (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974), p. 89.

[80]K. Patricia Cross, "Looking Beyond Academic Ability," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (April 22, 1974), p. 24.

[81]W. Todd Furniss, "Educational Programs for Everybody," Higher Education for Everybody?, edited by W. Todd Furniss (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971), p. 3.

[82]Ibid., p. 14.

[83]Engin I. Holmstrom, "'Older' Freshmen: Do They Differ from 'Typical' Undergraduates/" American Council on Education Research Reports, Vol. 8, no. 7. (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1973), passim.

[84]Ibid., p. 13.

[85]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Toward a Learning Society: Alternative Channels to Life, Work, and Service (McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), pp. 5-6.

[86]Ibid., p. 24.

[87]Cf. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Center for Educational Statistics, Digest of Educational Statistics, 1972 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), p. 81.

[88]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Toward a Learning Society, op. cit., p. 27.

[89]National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), p. 28.

[90]James R. Gass, "Learning in An Open Society: A European Viewpoint," paper presented at 29th National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, March 12, 1974.

[91]James O'Toole, "Education, Work and the Quality of Life," paper presented at 29th National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, March 11, 1974.

[92]Dorothy M. Gilford, "The Non-Collegiate Sector: Statistical Snapshot of Adult Continuing Education," paper presented at 29th National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, March 11, 1974.

[93]Cf. John K. Folger, "The Job Market for College Graduates," Journal of Higher Education, XLIII (March, 1972), pp. 203-223.

[94]Jack Magarrell, "College Graduates Seen Exceeding Demand by 10 Percent Between 1980 and 1985," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (June 24, 1974), p. 7.

[95]Malcolm G. Scully, "Academic Job Outlook Bleak for Ph.D.'s in English," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (June 24, 1972), p. 7.

[96]John K. Folger, "The Job Market for College Graduates," op. cit., pp. 204-206.

[97]Ibid., p. 209

[98]Ibid., p. 213.

[99]"Jobs: They're Available," Chronicle of HIgher Education, IX (December 23, 1974), p. 2.

[100]"This Year's Job Outlook," Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (January 13,1975) p. 2.

[101]"Freshmen, 10 Years Later: A Study Finds That 77 Pct. Have Received Degrees," Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (October 7, 1974), p. 3.

[102]"Students' Rights Vs. Confidential Files," Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (October 7, 1974), pp. 1, 4.

[103]"Buckley Amendment Modified," Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (December 23, 1974), p. 4.